Remarks

I. Status of claims

Claims 1-20 were pending.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 21-36 have been added. Claims 21-29 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 30-38 depend from independent claim 11.

Support for the amendments to independent claims 1 and 11 and for the features recited in claims 21-34 may be found on page 15, line 10, through page 19, line 15 of the specification.

II. Objections to the specification

The Abstract has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns regarding its length.

The Examiner has objected to the Specification on page 2, line 18, because there appeared to be an unmatched parenthesis. Upon review, however, it appears that the parentheses in this section of the Specification are correct. A comma has been added on line 17 of page 2 to clarify the list of examples within the parentheses beginning at line 16 and ending at line 18 of page 2.

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, 12, 15, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kurganov (U.S. 6,721,705).

A. Claims 1, 2, and 5-9

Claim 1 is an independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended and now recites that the system comprises "an access module configured to expose messaging/collaboration data, including at least one of electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data, that

are stored on a messaging/collaboration server, wherein the access module is configured to manage amount of data transmitted to the voice device to accommodate capacity constraints of the voice device."

Kurganov's voice browser system does not include an access module that is "configured to expose messaging/collaboration data, including at least one of electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data," as now recited in claim 1. Indeed, Kurganov's voice browser system is designed to allow "the searching and retrieving of publicly available information by controlling a web browsing server using naturally spoken voice commands" (col. 2, lines 60-63; emphasis added). Since electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data on a messaging/collaboration service do not constitute publicly available information, Kurganov's system would not be capable of accessing such data.

For at least this reason, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kurganov now should be withdrawn.

In addition, Kurganov's voice browser system does not include an access module that is configured to "manage amount of data transmitted to the voice device to accommodate capacity constraints of the voice device," as now recited in claim 1. Kurganov does not teach or suggest anything that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to believe that there was a need to accommodate capacity constraints of the voice enabled devices 112, much less anything that would have led such a person to "manage amount of data transmitted to the voice device to accommodate capacity constraints of the voice device." Indeed, Kurganov teaches that (col. 15, lines 23-28):

> Once the web browsing server 102 accesses the web sites specified in the URL 204 and retrieves the requested information, the information is forwarded to the media server 106. The media server uses the speech synthesis engine 302 to create an audio message that is then transmitted to the user's voice enabled device 112.

That is, Kurganov's voice browser system transmits the information that is retrieved from the specified web sites to the user's voice enabled device 112 without regard to the amount of data that is transmitted.

For this additional reason, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kurganov now should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 2 and 5-9 incorporates the features of independent claim 1 and therefore is patentable over Kurganov for at least the same reasons explained above.

B. Claims 11, 12, 15, and 17-19

Claim 11 is an independent claim. Claim 11 has been amended and now recites that the system comprises "an access module configured to expose messaging/collaboration data, including at least one of electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data, that are stored on a messaging/collaboration server, wherein the access module is configured to manage amount of data transmitted to the wireless device to accommodate capacity constraints of the wireless device."

The Examiner's rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kurganov now should be withdrawn for the same reasons explained above in connection with claim 1.

Each of claims 12, 15, and 17-19 incorporates the features of independent claim 11 and therefore is patentable over Kurganov for at least the same reasons.

IV. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 3, 4, 13, and 14

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Trower (U.S. 5,983,190). Claims 3 and 4 incorporate the features of independent claim 1 and claims 13 and 14 incorporate the features of independent claim 11.

The Examiner has indicated that:

> Kurganov et al., does not expressly disclose a Component Object Model (COM) to instantiate a server object in response to a request for service. However, Trower, II et al. teaches a client server animation system for speech input and output services of web page scripts using a speech synthesis engine and a speech recognition engine (Column 2, lines 21 to 49). A Component Object Model (COM) generates character animations to obtain general and specific information about a character (Column 17, line 24 to Column 20, line 19). COM interface provides format particularly well-suited to transfer

> data across process boundaries (Column 18, lines 2 to 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply a Common Object Model (COM) to instantiate server objects in response to a request for service as taught by Trower, II et al. in the voice browser system of Kurganov et al. for the purpose of providing a format particularly well-suited to transfer data across process boundaries.

Neither Kurganov nor Trower, however, teaches or suggests anything about responding to a request form completed by a voice device or a wireless device. Therefore, no permissible combination of Kurganov and Trower possibly could teach or suggest the features recited in claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 in which a voice interface access page is configured to invoke a COM object in response to a request form completed by a voice device or a wireless device.

Moreover, Trower does not make-up for the failure of Kurganov to teach or suggest an access module configured to expose messaging/collaboration data, including at least one of electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data, that are stored on a messaging/collaboration server, wherein the access module is configured to manage amount of data transmitted to the voice (wireless) device to accommodate capacity constraints of the voice device, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Trower now should be withdrawn.

B. Claim 16

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Zarom (U.S. 6,356,529). Claim 16 incorporates the features of independent claim 11.

The Examiner has cited Zarom for the proposition that "it is advantageous to translate between data transmitted according to the WAP network protocol and HTTP ... so as to enable cellular telephones to receive many types of multimedia data, including e-mail messages and web ..." (citations omitted). Zarom, however, does not make-up for the failure of Kurganov to teach or suggest an access module configured to expose messaging/collaboration data, including at least one of electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data, that are stored on a messaging/collaboration server, wherein the

access module is configured to manage amount of data transmitted to the wireless device to accommodate capacity constraints of the wireless device, as recited in claim 11.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Zarom now should be withdrawn.

C. Claims 10 and 20

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of the Workstyle Server White Paper. Claims 10 and 20 incorporate the features of independent claims 1 and 11, respectively.

The Examiner has cited the Workstyle Server White Paper for its teaching of "a server for storing messaging data for wireless devices having an advantage of increasing organizational productivity by giving employees greater command over their information, their communications, and the way they collaborate with colleagues, partners, and customers." The Workstyle Server White Paper, however, does not make-up for the failure of Kurganov to teach or suggest an access module configured to expose messaging/collaboration data, including at least one of electronic mail data, calendar data, contacts data, and tasks data, that are stored on a messaging/collaboration server, wherein the access module is configured to manage amount of data transmitted to the voice (wireless) device to accommodate capacity constraints of the voice device, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of the Workstyle Server White Paper now should be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 27, 2005

Edouard Garcia
Reg. No. 38,461
Telephone No.: (650) 631-6591

Please direct all correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599